DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 511 SO 000 397

AUTHOR Torney, Judith V.
TITLE Research in the Development of International Orientations During Childhood and Adolescence.
INSTITUTION American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 6 Sep 69
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Political Science Association, New York, New York, September 2-6, 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.35
DESCRIPTORS Bias, *Childhood Attitudes, Cognitive Processes, Cultural Pluralism, Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), Elementary School Students, *International Education, Language Role, *Political Attitudes, *Political Socialization, Research Projects, *Social Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The report gives the results of a pilot study on the attitudes of children concerning international topics. By use of a tightly structured questionnaire presented orally to children in grades 1 through 7, the author attempted to arrive at tentative findings concerning how attitudes toward other peoples and nations are formed and what role language plays in this formation. The results were: 1) the group membership of the child influences the attitudes held; 2) a relationship between the international attitudes and the cognitive process; 3) native language has an influence on the formation of attitudes toward other peoples and nations; and, 4) attitudes already held toward subjects of interest to the children influence the formation of international attitudes. Recommendations for further study are included along with a review of the literature, and a sample questionnaire. (CWB)

ED 045511

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Judith V. Torney
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

RESEARCH IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL ORIENTATIONS DURING CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE

Judith V. Torney
College of Education
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Prepared for delivery at the Sixty-Fifth Annual Meeting of The American Political Science Association, Commodore Hotel, New York City
September 2-6, 1969

Copyright, 1969, The American Political Science Association

The persistence of mankind, not merely of his political systems, is threatened in the present age. The international orientations of pre-adults have been the focus of only a few studies of political socialization. Perhaps this is because no political system presently makes authoratative decisions for the community of mankind.

Political socialization, although not guided by any comprehensive theory of socialization, has kept pace with a rapidly changing political-historical framework and has integrated such diverse elements as adult public opinion, visible political figures and events, childish forms of thought, concrete aspects of civics education curriculum, and student political activism. Questions about the process by which socialization occurs--part of it developmental and autonomous in nature, part of it instructional and intentional--are being asked more directly.[1] The popular research model is still to ask pre-adults to react to some portion of their domestic political system and to assess the content of their images. For comparative purposes children from Italy,[2] from England,[3] and from Uganda,[4] have been included (as well as other cross-national studies too

---

[1]R.D. Hess and J.V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children (Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1967--Reprinted in paperback by Doubleday-Anchor).

[2]T.M. Hennessey, "Democratic Attitudinal Configurations Among Italian Youth," Midwest Journal of Political Science, Vol. XIII, pp. 167-93, 1969.

[3]P. Abramson, "The Differential Political Socialization of English Secondary School Students," Sociology of Education, Vol. XL, pp. 255-260, 1967.

[4]K. Prewitt and J. Okello-Oculi, "Political Education and Political Socialization in New Nations," R. Sigel (ed.), Learning About Politics: Studies in Political Socialization. (New York: Random House, forthcoming).

SP 000 397

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

numerous to mention). However, in every case they have been asked primarily about their efficacy, awareness, and support for authority in the national political community of which they will ultimately be citizens. The assumption has been made that socialization can produce allegiance to no unit which is larger or more comprehensive than a nation-state--with the possible exception of weak and vague positive feelings about the United Nations.

The international system does present problems for the conceptualization of political socialization.[5] International decisions are made by persons who are less visible to the child than domestic political figures, and the decisions themselves have a less visible impact than domestic laws, for example. There are no processes in the international system corresponding to elections and voting in the domestic system whereby members can influence decision-makers.

Support for the broader international system is even more diffuse than support for a national political community because of the existence of strong allegiances to intermediate units at the nation-state level. This is in contrast to national identification where the child is expected to feel an attachment to America which surpasses any feelings about local or state government. The foreignness of other languages also seems to make it more difficult for children to realize commonality between themselves and those in other countries.

It is also true that conflict and disagreement is the major category in which international relations appear to children. War and ideological conflict (Communism as a threat to our way of life) are prominent. To understand the meaning that this has for children's orientations, it is important to notice that in most situations children prefer to focus on a view which minimizes conflict. This tendency in regard to the domestic political system is bolstered by most civics curriculum. The fact that the most visible and publicized aspects of the international system are defined in terms of conflict makes it a difficult realm for children to deal with.

---

[5] Within a political theory of political socialization such as that proposed by D. Easton and J. Dennis, Children in the Political System. (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1969)

Research Review

Because there is little information about international socialization, that which does exist is of particular importance. In a recent review of this material, several categories of research were summarized.[6]

First and best known is a small body of information concerning the development of children's concepts of their home country--geographically and politically--along with some suggestions about the meaning of national identity in an emotional sense. These studies are likely to include children in early elementary school because of the importance of this period for such basic attachments; it also includes several studies oriented toward Piaget's conceptual framework--tracing a succession of discrete stages and citing reciprocity, egocentric thought, and decentration as processes in the formation of concepts of national identity.[7]

The second category of studies includes descriptively and developmentally oriented studies of children's orientations toward other nation-states. Here the Lambert and Klineberg material is the most extensive, stressing stereotypes as organizing forces in children's comparison of their own country with others.[8] This is also the only

---

[6]J.V. Torney, L.F. Anderson, and H. Targ, "A Review of Existing and Needed Research on the Development of International Orientations During Childhood and Adolescence." Chapter IV of An Examination of Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in U.S. Secondary and Elementary Schools, a report by J. M. Becker to the U.S. Office of Education on Project No. 6-2908.

[7]G. Jahoda, "Children's Concepts of Nationality: A Critical Study of Piaget's Stages," Child Development, Vol. XXXV, pp. 1081-92, 1964; J. Piaget and A. Weil, "The Development in Children of the Idea of Homeland and of Relations with Other Countries," International Social Science Bulletin, No. III, pp. 561-78, 1951; E.A. Weinstein, "Development of the Concept of Flag and Sense of National Identity," Child Development, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 167-74, 1957.

[8]W.E. Lambert and O. Klineberg, Children's Views of Foreign People, (New York: Appleton-Century, Crofts, 1967).

major published study which assessed the attitudes toward foreign countries of children who came from several parts of the world. This study, which took place in 1959, has been criticized for poor sampling procedure within the several countries included. The questions used focused almost entirely upon the nation-state as a unit--children were asked for their evaluations of specific countries and for similarities and differences between them.

One of the authors' early conclusions is the following: "Children in certain cultural settings consider themselves as minority or majority members of a world community."[9] It should be added that children in many parts of the world consider particular other groups as minority members of their world community; in particular Chinese and African Negroes were considered by children in many countries to be "not like us". Perceived discontinuities of experience seem formative in children's understanding of the international system.

These authors also concluded that children in the United States, particularly those of about ten years of age, are receptive to approaches to foreign people and are interested in people who are dissimilar as well as those seen as similar to themselves. These children are curious about other countries even though their actual information about other countries may be limited to differences in clothing or language. By the age of fourteen, the children appear somewhat less open to positive views of foreign nations.

Another major conclusion of the Lambert and Klineberg study was that stereotyping probably begins by the age of six as the child views his own country, not as he views other countries and people:

> The first signs of stereotyped thinking turned up in the descriptions children gave of their own group rather than of foreign people; even at the six-year age level many different national groups of children made over-generalized statements about the personality traits of their own group at the same time as they described foreign people in more factual objective terms...From ten years of age and on, children start stereotyping foreign people.[10]

---

[9] Ibid., p. vii.

[10] Ibid., pp. 223-24.

These authors reviewed Piaget's suggestions that the young child assumes the attitudes arising in his situation to be the only possible ones--an egocentric approach. Only later in childhood does he acquire the understanding, for example, that he would be foreign if he visited another country and that others from different countries have different loyalties than his own. The authors also stress the confirmation in their findings for Piaget's idea that attitudes toward other countries are derived vicariously and unsystematically from various information sources.

The actual meaning of stereotyping, a defensible measure for it, and the degree to which the concept is valuable in understanding a child's restriction in dealing with the vast scope of the international world are unclear from this study. Perhaps given the nation-state system, with its requirements of national allegience, some stereotypes are the best adjustments we can expect from a child who has a mass of information to cope with. To discard stereotypes in all forms might require rearing children practically from birth to appreciate diversity and put less stress on ingroup feelings (with consequences of which we cannot be certain).

Perceptions of Communism, of the United Nations, and of war/peace were not included by Lambert and Klineberg. Torney and Hess,[11] for example, indicate that children at a very early age have negative attitudes toward Communism as a threat (although information making actual comparisons between the systems is lacking). The pervasiveness of these negative feelings is confirmed in large part by Morrison[12] in a study of British secondary school students and by Helfant[13] in a study comparing the international attitudes of American adolescents with their parents.

There is less research concerning pre-adults' orientations toward the United Nations. Hess and Torney[14] re-

---

[11]J.V. Torney and R.D. Hess, "The Development of International Attitudes in Children", in preparation.

[12]A. Morrison, "Attitudes of Children Towards International Affairs", Educational Research, Vol. IX, pp. 197-202, 1967.

[13]K. Helfant, "Parents' Attitudes Versus Adolescent Hostility in the Determination of Adolescent Socio-political Attitudes", Psychological Monographs, Vol.LXVI, No. 345, 1952.

[14]Hess and Torney, op.cit.

ported that older children are more likely than younger ones to see the U.N. rather than the United States as important in preventing war. The majority of children also felt that the U.N. does a good job in preventing wars.[15]

All of the studies reported thus far make the assumption that the nation-state (one's own and others') is the major relevant attitude object. The sparse nature of material on the United Nations is further evidence of this bias. Many studies have suggested that the perceived polarity of the United States and Russia and the idea of national differences are linked to many aspects of the child's perception of the international world, and that these attitudes are formed at a very early age.

In contrast to limited studies on the United Nations, there is rapidly expanding interest, particularly in Europe, in studies of international process--particularly peace and war. Cooper, who used a Piagetian framework to understand the schema which links personal, social, and international conflict, studied English and Japanese children ages 7 through 16.[16] He concluded that peace is usually interpreted by children to mean inner peace and the absence of conflict; they lack understanding of any vigorous drive toward international cooperation. Cooper also suggests that it is between the ages of nine and ten that the child's "patriotic filter" begins to screen out the negative images of home country and to stress the "we-they" dichotomy.

Alvik used Norwegian students in a similar study.[17] One of his major contributions was to relate the concepts of war and peace to performance on a Piaget-type abstract cognitive reasoning task. His final conclusion was:

> ...rather than applauding undertakings such as children's wearing UN emblems or depicting more or less stereotyped portrayals of people from remote cultures or epochs, we should recommend parents and teachers continuously to help the

---

[15]Torney and Hess, op.cit.

[16]P. Cooper, "The Development of the Concept of War", Journal of Peace Research, Vol. II, pp. 1-17, 1965.

[17]T. Alvik, "The Development of Views on Conflict, War, and Peace Among School Children: A Norwegian Case Study", Journal of Peace Research, Vol. V, pp. 171-95, 1968.

> children to analyze any conflict situation in terms of values fought for...to inform children about war as a conflict situation and peace as... a pattern of active cooperation.[18]

He stresses the orientation toward process rather than toward a personalized view of the system, much like the recommendations for the domestic situation following from recent political socialization studies.

Little peace research with children has been done in the United States although Sigel[19] points to the importance of peacemaking and friendship of all nations (including Russia) in children's post-assassination memories of President Kennedy.

Other major topics covered in the review included agents of socialization into international orientations and studies of curriculum effects (many of them done in Europe), studies of generational differences, and other topics within the general outline suggested by Dennis.[20]

Pilot Study on Membership Groups

From a concern with gaps in research oriented toward children's perceptions of the international system, there arose an interest in exploring the meaning to children of their membership in groups. This is a study which overlaps only slightly with the Lambert and Klineberg material, including less about specific countries, more about language, and more questions to determine children's orientations toward diversity and empathy toward the feelings of members of other groups. Interest lay not only in the content of international socialization but in the basis of children's judgement, the assumptions they make, and their way of interpreting and integrating information. These all bear a major relationship to cognitive-developmental conceptions of

---

[18] Ibid., p. 189.

[19] R.S. Sigel, "Image of a President: Some Insights Into the Political Views of School Children", American Political Science Review, Vol. LXII, pp. 216-26, 1968.

[20] J. Dennis, "Major Problems of Political Socialization Research", Midwest Journal of Political Science, Vol. XII, pp. 85-114, 1968.

political socialization.[21]

To investigate children's membership group conceptions, interviews were given to thirty-seven children from grades one through seven (eighteen boys and seventeen girls). In addition to the questions concerning nationality and linguistic group which are analyzed here, similar questions about economic class, race, and religion were included in the interview. The questions used appear in Appendix A of this paper. Graduate and undergraduate students in psychology classes at the Illinois Institute of Technology collected these interviews in December of 1968 and May of 1969. Student interviewers were given an hour's training in the use of this highly structured interview. The level of many of the responses is not much deeper than that which could have been obtained with a paper-and-pencil format, but some children did make additional comments indicating the basis for some of their answers. Interviews were taped when possible - recorded on paper by hand and immediately typed in other cases.

A coding system for the interviews was worked out by the author and an assistant. This assistant then taught the coding system to another assistant; the two of them modified unclear points and checked inter-rater reliability. There was perfect agreement on five interviews for judgments of "topic present or topic absent", e.g. "mentioned food as a reason other countries are different--yes, no, not asked"; "mentioned a specific country spontaneously when discussing differences between countries--yes, no, not asked", etc. The second assistant then coded all 37 interviews.[22]

Preliminary tabulations were done for grades 1 through 3 (ages 6 through 9) and for grades 4 through 7 (ages 9 through 13). There were 19 in the younger group and 18 in the older group. Data, in the form of tabulations as well as excerpts from interviews are cited as suggestive of topics that need to be explored more adequately in future research rather than as definitive information.

---

[21]Hess and Torney, op.cit., p. 21; Torney, Anderson, and Targ, op.cit., p. 227.

[22]The author is grateful to Natalie Morgan and Tom Baron for their assistance in this phase of the project. A faculty fellowship from the Illinois Institute of Technology freed time for the author for this project.

To introduce these data I present in its entirety the portion of an interview which dealt with nationality from a twelve-year-old boy from the lower socioeconomic level and a remedial fifth grade classroom.

I: What country do you live in?

S: America

I: How do you know that?

S: Everywhere I go--America, America. There are big buildings, and astronauts, and our flag.

I: Are all people in the world American like you?

S: No, they are from different nations like Australia, the North Pole, Jerusalem, and Japan.

I: How are people in other countries different from you?

S: They talk different, eat different, feel different, drink different, hate different. They do a whole lot of things different. They even walk different. In Japan they shape the children's feet. That's really different.

I: How are people in other countries the same as you?

S: They eat. They have numbers like ours--just different names like pesos, uno, dos, tres. They earn money like us. They have riots like us.

I: Would you rather be an American than to be from another country?

S: I'd rather.

I: Why would you rather be an American?

S: We live nicer. We have telephones and cars.

I: What do they have?

S: They have horses and buggies.

I: Do you have any other reasons?

S: Our houses are made from bricks, not straw. Also our farms and weapons are better.

I: Do you think things would be better if everyone in the world were American?

S: No, because they have different rules and understandings. They live in their countries all of them years, and they would feel sad about changing.

This interview illustrates the mixed nature of children's attitudes--some with contemporary referents (astronauts and riots), some more unusual elements which have stuck in the child's mind from various sources (the binding of children's feet in Japan), some almost slogan-like statements (they have horses and buggies). This is not a typical interview for a twelve-year old; it has some elements which would be more common in younger children. But it illustrates the varied nature of children's judgments and assumptions as well as the varied sources from which they come, in a way that only the citation of a large portion of a single interview can.

Other investigators have pointed to the confusion which many children experience concerning the meaning of the question--"What country do you live in?"[23] Out of the eighteen first through third graders interviewed only slightly more than half answered "America" or "the United States" when asked what country they live in. One eight year old boy answered, when asked if he had ever spent time in any other country, "Let me see--Florida, Puerto Rico, Canada, and Detroit." This confusion usually persists in spite of help from the interviewer. In contrast to this error is children's certainty about the language which they speak. All of the children interviewed answered correctly that they spoke "English"; in a few cases they first answered that they spoke "American", but quickly modified this to "English" usually with a nervous laugh or sheepish expression noted by the interviewer.

Children do recognize that not all people are American and they are very much aware of linguistic differences as well as of their own linguistic group membership. When asked how other countries differed from their country, more

---

[23] Jahoda, op. cit.

than seventy percent of the children at all ages spontaneously cited language. Customs, food, and race were also chosen by substantial numbers. For example, these were the responses of an eight year old boy:

I: How are people in other countries different from you?

S: Most talk Mexican.

I: Anything else?

S: Most talk different from us.

I: Do you think it would be better if everyone in the world were American?

S: Yes.

I: Why?

S: Because I want them to talk normal the way we do.

This is a rather extreme example of a child who feels that his group's way is the only normal way. His is an egocentric position, unable to see the perspective of others. It is important to note that the question about national differences and similarities was asked <u>prior</u> to questions asking specifically about language. When language was mentioned in response to a question about nations, the response was spontaneous on the part of the child.

Another child, a ten year old boy, perceives a mixture of differences between people, although mainly language.

I: How are people in other countries different from you?

S: Well some talk different and some people are different colors...and some talk French. Some talk Chinese and some talk Japanese.

I: Can you tell me any other ways that they're different that you know of?

S: Well, some people have different clothes than we do, and some just--are starving. Like the Vietnamese or something like that.

I: How are people in other countries the same as you are?

S: Some of the countries, they wear clothes. And some of the countries they have cars. That's all.

An eight year old boy (who is interviewed by a Japanese) also mentions instances where possessions (cars, clothes, houses) are the basis of similarities and some of the more exotic aspects of foreign life are viewed with considerable negative emotion.

I: Are all people American like you?

S: No, some people are Chineses like you.

I: What makes people not Americans?

S: They don't live in America. They wear funny clothes and they eat different food. Jimmy told me that people in Africa eat dogs and ants and terrible stuff like that. I can't see how they can eat the stuff. In France children go to school on Sunday. That's different. And they speak French too.

I: How are people in other countries the same as you?

S: They got houses that look like mine. I saw a picture last week of a house in England, and it looks just like mine.

This child at a young age expresses understanding of the relationship between living in a country and holding its citizenship. Many children report a single instance (like seeing the same house) which points up their similarity with those in other countries.

The following interview with an eleven-year-old girl also recognizes the relationship between living in a country and holding its citizenship (whatever language is spoken).

I: Are all the people in the world American like you?

S: No, some people speak French, Italian, and Portuguese.

I: What if people living in the U.S. spoke these languages?

S: Well, they American then.

I: How are people in other countries different from you?

S: They speak other languages.

I: Are there any other reasons?

S: They not American unless they lives here.

I: How are other people in other countries the same as you?

S: They people..everybody got blood..everybody not dumb.

A twelve year old when pressed for similarities between people considers their basic humanness:

I: How are people in other countries the same as you?

S: Well, at least they've got houses to live in.

I: What other way?

S: Well, they're people, instead of dogs or something.

Another eight-year-old answered--"well they're all living, they're all people, they all live in the same world".

One twelve year old had at least a rudimentary understanding of the meaning of national feeling as it is held in other nations. In answer to the question, "Are all of the people in the world American like you?", this child replied, "Well, it depends on how you look at it. They're American in that they have their own country and love their country, so they're like me." This is a clear opposite to the egocentric position; this girl has successfully decentered perception (to use Piaget's terminology) even to the extent of making an explicit comparison of her own perspective with that of other countries in contrast to the more traditional meaning of American national feeling.

The point needs to be emphasized, however, that the attitudes of any one child may be at several different levels for different attitude areas. Some attitudes are held within clear, coherent structures. Some are blatant stereotypes. Others are phrases or sayings that the child has heard though he may be unsure of their interpretation, as in the following interview with a nine-year-old boy:

I: How are people in other countries different from you?

S: Some people are from China; some people are from Africa; some people are from Israel.

I: How are they different from you?

S: Their language...let's see. The Japanese might have eyes like, you know, sort of pointed, and the Africans might have curly hair, and the Irish might always talk like, "Ah, me mate." Like that.

I: Can you think of any ways that people from other countries are the same as you?

S: I'm not sure. I've been listening to records and songs that, uh..

I: From another country?

S: No, they say some stuff about...I'm not sure. I think that it doesn't matter what color your skin is or what you are. It matters what's under you.

A small proportion of children, and usually older ones, mentioned government in discussing differences and similarities between countries. A ten year old girl concentrates on communism in the orient as well as on religion in Africa:

I: How are people in other countries different from you?

S: Well in Africa they have different ways, and in Viet Cong they have different ways. I'm studying about Communism. In Africa they believe in tribal beliefs and different gods, and in Viet Cong they have Communism.

I: How are people in other countries the same as you?

S: Like in England they vote; they have their own Presidents; they're free; they have their own government.

In judging countries to be similar or different, an interesting change appears to have taken place during the past ten years. It was indicated in the interview coding whether children spontaneously mentioned a foreign country when asked for differences between the U.S. and other countries. Oriental countries (particularly Viet Nam) were mentioned four times as often as countries in any other part of the world.

I: Are all the people in the world like you and me and your mommy and daddy?

S: Oh, no.

I: How are they different?

S: Well, Daddy was in Viet Nam when I was six and he showed me pictures of them. They don't look like me. They look poor and hungry. I guess that's the way a lot of people are.

It is interesting that in answer to these questions Russia was not mentioned as different. This is at some variance with the finding of Lambert and Klineberg,[24] who reported that when children were asked directly for a country that was different, Russia and Africa were frequently mentioned. Viet Nam, was, of course, not mentioned in 1959 although Oriental countries were frequently included. One of the results of America's highly visible, highly conflictual, frequently questioned involvement in an Asian war may have been in socialization to bring home to children the differences between themselves and oriental people.

To summarize, difference is usually based on language. Older children report more differences than younger children do (mean number of differences 2.9 compared to 1.6). Similarity to people from other countries for some consists of the characteristics of living humans, either concrete ("they all have blood") or more concerned with brotherhood ("it matters what's under you").

---

[24]Lambert and Klineberg, op.cit.

Cognitive process, particularly as it allows children to take the perspective of others is crucial here. However, there is also evidence for the existence of horizontal decalage. The child does not judge all questions with a single level of cognitive competency. Horizontal decalage is another way of referring to the mixed nature of children's attitudes. Flavell summarizes Piaget's term as follows:

> The concept of horizontal decalage represents the fact that, whereas it may be useful to think of an individual as being generally characterized by a given cognitive structure, he will not necessarily be able to perform within that structure for all tasks. Task contents do differ in the extent to which they resist and inhibit the application of cognitive structures. This is a fact which a stage theory must reckon with, however much it may lend a certain equivocality to statements like "Individual A is in stage X." In brief, the existence of horizontal decalages seems to point up a certain heterogeneity where only homogeneity might have been suspected.[25]

When an analysis of social development in terms of other countries is performed using flexible concepts of stages within a cognitive developmental model, the invariances (homogeneity) as well as the heterogeneity will become clearer.

The question "would you rather be American than from another country?" evoked a more evaluative and nationalistic response than did the question about differences and similarities. Two six year old boys were still fighting World War II indicating once again the important place held by war in children's concepts of international relations. One of them was questioned as follows:

> I: Would you rather be an American than to be from another country?
>
> S: Yes
>
> I: Why?
>
> S: Because I like it; because it's good. It's

---

[25]J.H. Flavell, The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget. (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1963), p. 23.

not fun being a German because you have to be in a war. Japanese have to go to war.

More than eighty percent of the children chose to be American rather than from another country, although some of the reasons were highly concrete and personal ("I'd rather be American because over in Mexico you have to drink that icky water."); some were concrete but more realistic ("Other countries are real poor; they live in beaten down farms. America is a little like that, but other countries are all like that."). This response is also quite stereotyped. About one sixth of the children stressed the freedom and government of the United States, as the following eight-year-old boy:

I: Would you rather be an American than to be from another country?

S: Yes, because Mrs. Jones told us that Americans are the only free people in the whole world.

I: What do you mean like that?

S: We talk like we want, and when Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, he said all this.

And a similar response from a twelve-year-old:

I: Do you think you'd like to be American rather than from another country?

S: Well, I think all countries are about the same to live in 'cause you all have to pay taxes and things like that. But America's a pretty nice place. You know, freedom-wise.

The mention of Russia and Communism was more frequent in response to this question about where the child would prefer to live than in the previous question on perceived differences. Perhaps this linking of negative feeling with Communism and Russia makes it more likely in evaluative contexts. As indicated from other studies, there seems to be little ideological content to children's opinions about Russia,apart from lack of freedom there.

I: Why would you rather be an American?

S: A lot to do. There's well, you can do a lot more around here. Well than say living in,

uh, Cummunism or something. When you get older they give you the jobs.

A few children (3 of the 34 answering this question) connected their desire to speak English to their desire to be American--from a ten-year-old boy, "I'd rather be American because if I was Chinese or something and came to visit I wouldn't know any of the American language." This percentage was considerably lower than the 25 out of 36 who answered that language was the main difference between their country and other countries. Children's own language is so much a part of them that it does not occur to most of them as an advantage to being American, only as a way of delineating differences between themselves and other countries when the stress is on differences.

Children who said yes in answer to the question "do you think things would be better if everyone in the world were American?" were most likely to discuss the decreased probability of war under such a condition ("'cause we wouldn't have Viet Nam fights and world fights") A ten-year-old boy included improved economic situation as well as peace ("well, because there wouldn't be starving or there wouldn't be any fighting or anything like that."). Children seem to realize from an early age that countries that are in disagreement are the basic cause of war. Their pictures of war often have flags in them, for example.

Some of the negative responses to the idea of making the world over as Americans concerned the feasibility of moving the world population to America--"No, there wouldn't be enough room or enough food" from a six-year-old. Still another child, a nine-year-old, took an egocentric and imperialist point of view toward the value of having countries other than America in the world--"No, because if they were all in America, because they can't grow like sugar and stuff, and if everybody lived in America then there wouldn't be anybody else to grow all the food that we eat."

A number of children put positive value on diversity, some with a more concrete approach than others. All of the following were twelve-year-olds, illustrating also the most common types of response to questions about the feelings of others if they were to become American:

I: Do you think it would be better if all the people in the world were American?

S: No, well different people make different things, like the Italian shoes. And if we were all

American nobody would make different things, and everybody might not like the same things. They might want something different. Like what if a person wanted Italian shoes?

And from another twelve-year-old; stressing ideology, economic advantage, and diversity as the spice of life:

I: Do you think things would be better if everyone in the world were American?

S: No, I don't really think so. It would be dull. There would be no one to confer opinions with. It would be a dull world.

I: How do you think people in other countries would feel about becoming American?

S: I don't think they would want to. Some of the small countries might not mind; maybe the Communist countries that don't like that way of living. But if the people are well off they wouldn't especially want to.

Another twelve-year-old is even more explicit about the value of difference and also recognizes the negative value of domination of one country by another:

I: Do you think it would be better if all the people in the world were American?

S: No, because then there wouldn't be any differences in opinion, as much, like they wouldn't, you wouldn't have as much difference. Everything would be the same, like there wouldn't be any joy in going to another country if you knew it was America (laugh).

I: How do you think people in other countries would feel about being American?

S: Well, I don't think they'd like it, because they'd rather...I think every people like to be independent of another country, because if there were a whole world's power, you'd know that some, somebody would want to break off.

To summarize the results of all the interviews, when children were asked to project how people in other countries would feel if they had to become Americans, older children

perceived this as a more mixed reaction, with positive and negative aspects.

The interview questions which asked about language directly point clearly to the influence of cognitive development upon social development. Several types of responses may be discerned in children's concepts of language. Some children when asked why different languages are spoken concentrated on enumerating instances, like the seven-year-old girl who said "Because some are Spanish, and they talk Spanish; some are Chinese, and they talk Chinese; some are Japanese and they talk Japanese". Others attributed the reason for different languages to an authority, divine or mortal: "Well, its probably because of their first ruler, how he spoke" or "I suppose God made it that way to be more of a challenge to people on earth". Still others, including some older children, see individuals born into their linguistic systems:

I: Why do you think people in other countries speak different languages?

S: Well, they're born to speak that way. I don't know how, but they are.

I: How do you think people in other countries would feel about learning to speak English if this were made a law?

S: They probably wouldn't like it if they were born to speak their language.

Although lacking some specific knowledge the following interview with a ten-year-old girl indicates her concept of reversibility in language--an awareness that may be quite important from the cognitive-developmental point of view in understanding linguistic membership groups--that is, the concept of translatability:

I: Why do you think people in other countries speak different languages?

S: Well, because they..they..well, their fathers spoke that way so that that's the way they learn, but I don't know how it originated.

I: Do you think that things would be better in the world if everyone spoke English?

S: Well, it wouldn't really matter what language.

But it doesn't really matter because you can always translate the language.

I: How do you think people in other countries would feel if a law were made to make them speak English?

S: I don't think they'd like it because they would have to change and they...why should they change and not us? Why not people from America?

When children expressed positive reactions to making English a universal language it was usually because of improved communication, sometimes with a very egocentric flavor, "Because when they talked to me I would know what they said". A six-year-old presumed that people in other countries would like to speak English "because I don't think they like the way they do it". A ten-year-old linked common language not only with improved communication but with a lessened threat of violence--"well..they'd understand you better. Like if they think that you're insulting them, they could like kill you or something like that".

As with the idea of making all the world in to Americans, some children focus upon the concrete feasibility of an English speaking world. An eight-year-old girl reported that "I'd think they wouldn't (want to learn English). Maybe some poor people wouldn't have money and couldn't go to school and would then be breaking the law if they couldn't speak English". Others, like a six-year-old girl, concentrated on legal consequences--"they would feel very bad if they had to..I mean if they were made to..and if they didn't do it they would be fired from their job and have to go to jail".

Among older children, many did not agree with the making of such a law. Several stressed the value of diversity, others the perception that people are attached to their own languages.

I: Do you think it would be better if everyone in the whole world spoke English?

S: No, because other people must have their own customs and language, and if everyone spoke the same we couldn't learn other languages. Everyone can't be the same.

Conclusion

These pilot data, when linked to previous research suggest several very fruitful areas for further work.

1. The meaning of children's membership in groups needs to be more fully explored since this influences their judgment of much experience and is crucial in determining the future course of international education.

2. The process by which international orientations are formed and organized must be part of any investigation. Simply to map the content of the attitudes is not sufficient. The attempt here has been to suggest the relationship of cognitive process to various kinds of social attitudes.

In psychology during recent years the development of language has become a focus of a tremendous amount of research and has been extensively linked to a study of the development of cognitive process. From even the pilot study data collected and reported here, it is clear that language speaking and learning has a discernable influence on socialization as well as upon cognitive development.

It has an impact upon basic development of feelings about one's own group and other groups, and influences feelings of being different from or the same as others. Language and ease of communication are ways of understanding children's appreciation of diversity and similarity. Not only is it useful to consider cognitive development, language development, and social development from the point of view of common stages, it appears that the development of language and the perception of language as one's own bears a strong and unique relationship to children's socialization into national membership groups and their orientations toward other countries.

3. Certain topics of interest to the field in general appear rather naturally in children's orientations as expressed in these interviews--attitudes toward diversity, attitudes toward the earth as a planet and the human species as its inhabitant, attitudes toward alternatives to the nation-state. Research must be guided by both the

theoretical interest of the researcher and the topics which children can discuss. The fact that children spontaneously mention several topics of great interest to researchers is encouraging for the future.

The most general conclusion is, of course, that international socialization take its place with domestic political socialization, high on the list of priorities of the political scientist. It is rich in developmental change, in relation to conflict, in importance for persistence and change in systems, and in cognitive complexity.

* * *

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ON NATIONAL AND LINGUISTIC MEMBERSHIP GROUPINGS

What country do you live in? (If the child answers "Illinois", ask him if he can name another country.)

How do you know that?

Are all the people in the world American like you?

How are people in other countries different from you? (Try to get at least two ways)

Would you rather be an American than to be from another country?

(If yes) Why would you rather be an American?
(If no) Which other country? Why would you rather be from there?

Do you think that things would be better if everyone in the world were American? Why?

How do you think people in other countries would feel about becoming American?

What language do you speak? Do all the people in the world speak _____like you?

Why do people in other countries speak different languages?

Do you think that things would be better if everyone in the world spoke English? Why?

How do you think people in other countries would feel about learning to speak English if this were made a law?